

Application No. 10/809,151
Amendment dated December 28, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on October 5, 2007, and the references cited therewith.

No claims are amended, canceled, or added; as a result, claims 1-28 are now pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-10, 12, 13 and 15-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitroda (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,271) in view of Iijima (U.S. Patent No. 4,887,234). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Applicant's independent claims 1 and 13, as previously presented, each recites:

program instructions stored in the memory and executed by the processor to selectably modify the variety of user information, including updating, editing, and deleting, based on instructions from the user input directly to the card.

Applicant respectfully submits that the specification of the present disclosure as originally filed supports inclusion of "selectably modify the variety of user information, including updating, editing, and deleting, based on instructions from the user input directly to the card" as an inventive step. For example, the specification recites, "input can be provided directly to the display screen and converted to instructions which can be received by and operated on by the processor". (Page 10, lines 23-25). The specification goes on to recite, "user selectable input information provided to the touch sensitive screen, provided to the user input cluster or otherwise, to modify particular user information". (Page 10, lines 31-22).

In contrast, the Examiner states in section 3 of the October 5, 2007, Office Action that the Pitroda reference "does not clearly and specifically teach program instructions to selectably modify the variety of user information, including deleting." However, the Examiner went on to state with regard to the Iijima reference, "The

Application No. 10/809,151
Amendment dated December 28, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2007

CPU 11 of manipulator 10 supplies an address at which data to be deleted is stored along with a specific condition for deleting data to CPU 3 (col 5, lines 64-66)."

Applicant notes that the Iijima reference states in column 5, lines 4-8:

IC card reader/writer section 20 is connected to card manipulator 10 through cable 22. More specifically, as shown in FIG. 8, section 20 has convey path 31 for conveying IC card 1 inserted from card insertion port 21.

Applicant also notes in column 4, lines 59-63, of the Iijima reference:

FIGS. 6 and 7 show the arrangement of IC card manipulator 10 as a terminal device according to the present invention. Reference number 11 denotes a CPU (Central Processing Unit) for controlling the entire device; 12, a keyboard for inputting data; 13, a CRT display unit; . . . and 20, an IC card reader/writer section for reading or writing data from or in a memory.

Hence, the Iijima reference appears to describe an IC card manipulator as terminal device (i.e., a computer) connected through a cable to an IC card reader/writer section having an insertion port through which the IC card can be inserted for reading or writing data. The Iijima reference does not describe, teach, or suggest program instructions stored in a memory and executed by a processor to selectably modify the variety of user information, including updating, editing, and deleting, based on instructions from the user input directly to the card.

Applicant's independent claim 4, as previously presented, recites:

program instructions stored in the memory and executed by the processor to selectably modify the variety of user information, including updating, editing, and deleting, based on instructions from the user input directly to the card;

In addition, independent claims 19 and 22, as previously presented, each recites:

selectably modifying the variety of user information, including updating, editing, and deleting, based on instructions from the user input directly to the card.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention is neither taught by, nor made obvious in view of, the combination of the Pitroda

Application No. 10/809,151
Amendment dated December 28, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2007

and Iijima references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of independent claims 1, 4, 13, 19, and 22, as previously presented, as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitroda (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,271) in view of Iijima (U.S. Patent No. 4,887,234) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Goman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,196,459). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Claim 11 depends from independent claim 4. As described above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 4 is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that the Goman reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Pitroda and Iijima references. That is, Applicant respectfully submits that with regard to the present invention, under KSR or otherwise, the Goman reference does not describe, teach, or suggest, “selectably modify the variety of user information, including updating, editing, and deleting, based on instructions from the user input directly to the card”, as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 4, as previously presented.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of dependent claim 11.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitroda (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,271) in view of Iijima (U.S. Patent No. 4,887,234) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Gangi (U.S. Patent No. 6,293,462 as cited by the Applicant) and Hasegawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,055,662). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Claim 14 depends from independent claim 13. As described above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that the Gangi and Hasegawa references, independently or in combination, do not cure the deficiencies of the Pitroda and Iijima references. That is, Applicant respectfully submits that with regard to the

Application No. 10/809,151
Amendment dated December 28, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2007

present invention, under KSR or otherwise, the Gangi and Hasegawa references do not describe, teach, or suggest, "selectably modify the variety of user information, including updating, editing, and deleting, based on instructions from the user input directly to the card", as recited in Applicant's independent claim 13, as previously presented.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of dependent claim 14.

Application No. 10/809,151
Amendment dated December 28, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2007

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Karl Bring at (970) 898-7244 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on

December 28, 2007

Lillian K. Awe
Name

Lillian Awe
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Antony M. Justin

By Applicant's Representatives,
Brooks, Cameron & Huebsch, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: Edward J. Brooks III
Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date: 12/28/2007